REMARKS

Claims 1, 11, 12 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support of the new claims and claim amendments may be found throughout the specification as originally filed, for example, at paragraph 0090-0095.

Claim rejection -- nonstatutory double patenting

Certain claims have been rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 7,349,810. Applicant has filed a terminal disclaimer herewith. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

Claim rejection -- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0114643 to Bryant-Rich ("Rich"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,857,205 to Roth ("Roth"). Claims 4-5, 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rich, in view of Roth, in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0187993 to Ribot ("Ribot").

But, the cited references nowhere teach automatically detecting changes in application programs *by judging if the change is within a standard range established at the time of initial installation qualification*, as recited in the claims.

The present application discloses, *inter alia*, a system for detecting changes in application programs. At the time of initial installation qualification a standard range for changes may be established. Then, the system can detect changes in the application if judging if the change is within that established standard range. To illustrate, the range allows for minor, insignificant changes, such as background color or font type, but would trigger detection of larger, significant changes, for example (Specification, ¶ 0070).

Rich, on the other hand, monitors for *all changes* to a computer system made by an application. Rich's system strives to identify all changes to a computer system when an application is being run, so that those changes can later be undone, effectively removing any trace that the application was run (Rich, ¶ 0036, 0045).

Accordingly, Rich does not disclose detecting changes in application programs *by judging if the change is within a standard range established at the time of initial installation qualification*, as recited in the claims. Because proper operation of the Rich system requires that *all changes* be monitored and recorded, the Rich system is in fact incompatible with the notion of a standard range established at the time of initial installation. And, Rich certainly does not disclose any such range as part of the logic of detecting changes in application programs, as claimed.

Applicant submits that Roth and Ribot fail to teach this feature as well. Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and a Notice of Allowance.

Date: August 11, 2010

/Michael A. Koptiw/
Michael A. Koptiw
Registration No. 57,900

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439